

Khrushchev's partners and suggests that the consolidation of power by one man is in the offing. He wrote this essay before the expulsion of the antiparty group.

But the theory that generates these predictions militates against finding trends indicating change in Soviet politics. For example, Wolfe finds that although new leaders may exhibit novel characteristics, the change is essentially superficial and "within-system." He takes the long view and emphasizes the durability of Soviet institutions. A writer with a different emphasis might find, for example, that Khrushchev was a revolutionary who tried to effect a kind of populist egalitarianism in Soviet society. In his radical Leninism he sought major changes in social stratification by coercing the children of the intelligentsia to engage in manual labor; by stressing the party role of military commanders and thus setting them up as equals with other party members in the military unit, regardless of position in the hierarchy of command; by enlisting as propagandists millions of the educated in a campaign to subject the entire adult population to the study of the Marxist-Leninist classics. Similarly, a different emphasis might lead one to examine official directives in the light of the success or failure of their implementation. Wolfe describes the leaders' stated intentions to blanket the country with agitators at election time, but how many inefficient or unwilling agitators shirk their duties? Wolfe gives an excellent analysis of the Soviet attempt to rewrite history, but what kind of dissonance, demoralization, or cynicism results from the effort? Does dissent indicate the failure of socialization? All of these questions might be submerged in the long view. It is a matter of emphasis.

ELLEN MICKIEWICZ
Michigan State University

LES BOLCHÉVIKS PAR EUX-MÊMES. By *Georges Haupt* and *Jean-Jacques Marie*. Translated by *Claude Kiejman*, *Nadine Marie*, and *Catherine Reguin*. Glossary by *Claudie Weill*. Bibliothèque socialiste, 13. Paris: François Maspero, 1969. 398 pp. 24.65 F.

The study of the Soviet political order has commonly been neglectful in one respect that is vital to the real understanding of political systems—that is, little notice is given to persons just below the top, who figure more in tables of organization than in personalized headlines, but who have nonetheless contributed in myriads of ways to the shape of this system. This neglect is of course partly attributable to the paucity of detailed biographical information on the lesser lights of the Soviet hierarchy, although there is more of this kind of information available for the early Soviet period than for later years.

One of the most significant sources on the middle-ranking Soviet leadership of the revolution and the first Soviet decade is the now extremely rare *Entsiklopedicheskiĭ slovar'* published by the Granat Institute of Russian Bibliography in Moscow in the 1920s, with a special supplement to the three parts of volume 41 that contains autobiographies or authorized biographies of some two hundred Communist leaders of the pre- and immediate postrevolutionary periods. The high points of this material have now been made more readily available in a fine job of editing by Georges Haupt and Jean-Jacques Marie.

Georges Haupt is the assistant director of the Centre de Documentation sur la Russie et les Pays Slaves under the École Pratique des Hautes Études in Paris. Jean-Jacques Marie is a teacher and translator of Russian literature, and a biographer of Stalin. The two collaborators have selected for translation fifty-three of

the most important Granat biographies, to which they have added critiques of the material and summaries of each man's career and fate subsequent to the original publication, as well as notes on the revolutionary tacticians Podvoisky and Kaiurov. They have also written an enlightening introduction on the politics of Soviet publishing in the twenties as it affected certain of the biographical texts.

Haupt and Marie have organized the biographies and autobiographies by political category (an asterisk before the name indicates a biography, the others are all autobiographies): seven "grand protagonists" (Bukharin, *Kamenev, *Lenin, *Stalin, *Sverdlov, *Trotsky, and *Zinoviev); the prewar Bolsheviks (Andreev, Shliapnikov, *Kaiurov, Drobnis, Dybenko, Yenukidze, *Frunze, *Kalinin, *Ter-Petrossian, Kossior, Kirov, Krestinsky, Krupskaya, Litvinov, *Molotov, Muralov, *Ordzhonikidze, Piatakov, *Podvoisky, Preobrazhensky, Raskolnikov, Serebriakov, Skrypnik, Smilga, Ivan Smirnov, Sokolnikov, Sosnovsky, Stassova, Chubar, *Tomsky, and Voroshilov); the early dissidents (Antonov-Ovseenko, Alexander Bogdanov, *Krasin, Lozovsky, Lunacharsky, *Manuilsky, and *Rykov); and the adherents of 1917, native and foreign (Dzerzhinsky, Ioffe, Kollontai, *Uritsky, Radek, Rakovsky, *Larissa Reisner, *Chicherin, *Tukhachevsky, and *Volodarsky).

A glance through this table of contents confirms that the great majority of the most important—and most interesting—of the early Soviet leaders found themselves sooner or later in opposition to Stalin, and then inevitably the victims of his purge (unless they had died in the meantime). Since a fair number of these people are still unpersons in Soviet history, it is all the more important that Western scholarship should keep alive some appreciation of their roles. Here in the Haupt-Marie volume the reader can acquaint himself with the personal character and background of such men as, for example, Nikolai Krestinsky, bourgeois lawyer turned revolutionary (not unlike Lenin), Communist Party secretary from 1919 to 1921, who played a key role in Soviet diplomacy in the twenties and distinguished himself in the end as the only man to repudiate his purge trial confession.

One could quarrel with the omission of certain Granat biographies from the present volume (Kuibyshev, Riazanov, Krylenko, Osinsky), but on the whole the editors have chosen well to put the most important of these sketches before the Western public. The biographies contain much valuable though episodic detail on Soviet politics of the early period. They are the only substantial source on the backgrounds of many of their subjects, and hence indispensable for conclusions about such influences—for instance, that political experience in the emigration was more important than intellectual upbringing in leading a man into one of the opposition groups. The autobiographies in particular tend to dwell on their authors' early lives and give an unaccustomed human touch to the depiction of the Bolshevik movement.

Frequently the Granat presentations are as interesting for their judicious self-censorship as for what they actually say. The editors make the implications of these lapses clear, and fill the gaps very effectively. Altogether Haupt and Marie have produced an indispensable reference book for students of the Bolshevik movement and the early Soviet period.

ROBERT V. DANIELS
University of Vermont